

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	•
	10/537,579	02/10/2006	Steven Bates	2543-1-046PCT/US	4889	•
	23565 7	7590 09/18/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
	KLAUBER & JACKSON 411 HACKENSACK AVENUE HACKENSACK, NJ 07601			GANGLE,	GANGLE, BRIAN J	
				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				1645	1645	
				DATE MAILED: 09/18/2000	DATE MAILED: 09/18/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		,	BATES, STEVEN				
		10/537,579	Art Unit				
		Examiner					
	The MAILING DATE of this communication and	Brian J. Gangle	orrespondence address				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailling date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1)⊠ F	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 June 2005</u> .						
,—	This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.						
· —	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Disposition of Claims							
4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-22 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Application Papers							
 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. 							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
2) Notice 3) Inform	of References Cited (PTO-892) of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Di 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate				

Application/Control Number: 10/537,579

Art Unit: 1645

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-3 and 8, drawn to methods of screening for compounds that impair SEC14 function.

Group II, claim(s) 4-7, drawn to modified eukaryotic cells expressing SEC14.

Group III, claim(s) 9-10 and 17, drawn to compounds that impair SEC14 function and pharmaceutical compositions comprising said compounds.

Group IV, claim(s) 11, drawn to Candida SEC14.

Group V, claim(s) 11, drawn to Aspergillus SEC14.

Group VI, claim(s) 14-16 and 18-22, drawn, in part, to methods of treatment of fungal infection by administering a SEC14 inhibitor.

Group VII, claim(s) 14-16 and 18-22, drawn, in part, to methods of prevention of fungal infection by administering a SEC14 inhibitor.

The inventions listed as Groups I-VI do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

The technical feature linking Groups I-VI appears to be a fungal SEC14.

However, Riggle et al. (Microbiol., 143:3527-3535, 1997) disclose SEC14 from Candida albicans (see figure 3).

Therefore, the technical feature linking the inventions of groups I and II does not constitute a special technical feature as defined by PCT Rule 13.2, as it does not define a contribution over the art.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

A telephone call was made to David Jackson on 8/21/2006 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Application/Control Number: 10/537,579

Art Unit: 1645

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian J. Gangle whose telephone number is (571) 272-1181. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Navarro can be reached on (571) 272-0861. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/537,579 Page 5

Art Unit: 1645

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brian Gangle AU 1645

ROBERT A. ZEMAN PRIMARY EXAMINAR